REMARKS

Claims 8-10, 15, and 26-38 are pending. Claims 8-10, 15, and 26-38 are canceled herein without prejudice to Applicant pursuing these claims in a related application. New claims 39-57 have been added. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the specification and the claims as filed. In particular, support for new claim 39 can be found, for example, in original claims 1 and 8 and on page 21, lines 14-21, page 55, lines 17-32, and Table 2, page 56. Support for new claims 40 and 45-57 can be found in original claims 9 and 26-38, respectively. Support for new claims 41-44 can be found, for example, on page 21, lines 14-21, page 55, lines 17-32, and Table 2, page 56. Accordingly, these new claims do not raise an issue of new matter and entry thereof is respectfully requested. Entry of the proposed amendments is respectfully submitted to be proper because the amendments are believed to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The rejection of claims 8-10, 15 and 26-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking enablement is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully maintains, for the reasons of record, that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance to enable the claimed methods. Nevertheless, to further prosecution and without addressing the merits of the rejections set forth in the Office Action, claims 8-10, 15 and 26-38 have been canceled herein without prejudice to Applicant pursuing the claims in a related application. Therefore, this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims, and Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to new claims 39-57, these new claims are directed to methods of extending corneal graft survival following corneal transplantation in a patient by administering to the patient an effective amount of a pharmaceutical composition comprising an indolinone vascular endothelial growth factor receptor-3 (VEGFR-3) kinase inhibitor, whereby lymphangiogenesis is suppressed in the cornea of the patient. Dependent claims 41-44 recite the specific indolinones 3(2,4-dihydroxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE87); 3-(3-fluoro-4-methoxy-

benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE106); and 3-(4-dimethylamino-naphthalen-1-ylmethylene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAZ51).

In the Office Action, enablement is acknowledged for the VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors 3(2,4-dihydroxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE87); 3-(3-fluoro-4-methoxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE106); and 3-(4-dimethylamino-naphthalen-1-ylmethylene) -1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAZ51). Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance to enable a method of extending corneal graft survival following corneal transplantation by administering an effective amount of a pharmaceutical composition comprising an indolinone VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitor. In particular, the specification teaches that VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors useful in the invention include specific VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors such as indolinones and teaches exemplary indolinones, including MAE87, MAE106 and MAZ51 (page 21, lines 14-21, page 55, lines 17-32, and Table 2, page 56). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance to enable new claims 39-57, which are directed to methods of extending corneal graft survival following corneal transplantation in a patient using indolinone VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors.

The rejection of claims 8-10, 15 and 26-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly lacking written description is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully maintains, for the reasons of record, that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance for the claimed methods. Nevertheless, to further prosecution and without addressing the merits of the rejections set forth in the Office Action, claims 8-10, 15 and 26-38 have been canceled herein without prejudice to Applicant pursuing the claims in a related application. Therefore, this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of these claims, and Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Regarding new claims 39-57 and as discussed above, these new claims are directed to methods of extending corneal graft survival following corneal transplantation in a patient by administering to the patient an effective amount of a pharmaceutical composition comprising an indolinone vascular endothelial growth factor receptor-3 (VEGFR-3) kinase inhibitor, including

the specific indolinones 3(2,4-dihydroxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE87); 3-(3-fluoro-4-methoxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE106); and 3-(4-dimethylamino-naphthalen-1-ylmethylene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAZ51), whereby lymphangiogenesis is suppressed in the cornea of the patient. As acknowledged in the Office Action, the specification teaches exemplary indolinone VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors 3(2,4-dihydroxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE87); 3-(3-fluoro-4-methoxy-benzylidene)-1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAE106); and 3-(4-dimethylamino-naphthalen-1-ylmethylene) -1,3-dihydro-indol-2-one (MAZ51).

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance for the claimed methods and teaches a representative number of species for the claimed genus. In particular, the specification teaches that VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors useful in the invention include specific VEGFR-3 kinase inhibitors such as indolinones and teaches exemplary indolinones, including MAE87, MAE106 and MAZ51 (page 21, lines 14-21, page 55, lines 17-32, and Table 2, page 56). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification provides sufficient description and guidance to convey to one skilled in the art that Applicant was in possession of the claimed invention at the time the application was filed.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite is respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has been rendered moot by the cancellation of this claim and, therefore, requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is respectfully requested to consider the above remarks. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent if there are any questions.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 502624 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Deborah L. Cadena
Registration No. 44,048

4370 La Jolla Village Drive, Suite 700
San Diego, CA 92122
Phone: 858.535.9001 DLC:jrl
Facsimile: 858.597.1585
Date: April 7, 2005

Please recognize our Customer No. 41552 as our correspondence address.

SDO 20002-1.066872.0020